



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/721,884	11/24/2000	Emden Gansner	1999-0730	4129

7590

08/13/2003

Samuel H. Dworetsky
AT&T CORP. P.O. BOX 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110

EXAMINER

PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

21

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/721,884

Applicant(s)

GANSNER ET AL.

Examiner

Sathyanarayan Pannala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

24

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because they fail to show necessary textual labels of features or symbols in Figs. 1, 7 as described in the specification. For example, placing a label or suitable reference number in each blank block of Fig. 1, would give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this element at a glance. A **descriptive** textual label for **each numbered element** in these figures would be needed to fully and better understand these figures without substantial analysis of the detailed specification. Any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be shown in the drawing. Optionally, applicant may wish to include a table next to the present figure to fulfill this requirement. See 37 CFR 1.83. 37 CFR 1.84(n)(o) is recited below:

"(n) Symbols. Graphical drawing symbols may be used for conventional elements when appropriate. The elements for which such symbols and labeled representations are used must be adequately identified in the specification. Known devices should be illustrated by symbols which have a universally recognized conventional meaning and are generally accepted in the art. Other symbols which are not universally recognized may be used, subject to approval by the Office, if they are not likely to be confused with existing conventional symbols, and if they are readily identifiable.

(o) Legends. Suitable descriptive legends may be used, or may be required by the Examiner, where necessary for understanding of the drawing, subject to approval by the Office. They should contain as few words as possible."

2. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-6, 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters (US Patent 5,715,334) hereinafter Peters, and in view of Burfeind et al. (US Patent 6,052,648) hereinafter Burfeind.
5. As per independent claims 1, 8, Peters teaches the following:

“a visualization interface” (as per spec., interface is a module and as per prior art, technique is used in a module) at Fig. 5, col. 14, line 63 to col. 15, line 36;

“a plurality of processing tools” at Fig. 6, col. 18, line 59 to col. 19, line 1;

Fig. 23, col. 29, lines 22-25;

“means for streaming the data to one or more processing tools to create data results that may be displayed by the visualization interface” at Fig. 23, col. 29, lines 22-65.

Peters does not teach accessing data in a self-describing format. However, Burfeind teaches “means for accessing data in a self-describing format” at Fig. 5-6, 9, col. 5, lines 2-13. Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate accessing data in a self-described format. Peters and Burfeind are combined as they teach visualization of images and to relate accessing data format. In order to visualize the required image, audio and video input are real-time mapped into texture image.

6. As per dependent claims 2, 9, Peters teaches “the visualization interface provides linked views of the data results” at col. 28, lines 29-33.

7. As per dependent claims 3, 10, Peters teaches “the visualization interface is capable of presenting a statistical two-dimensional view, a pixel-oriented two-dimensional view, and a dynamic three-dimensional detailed view” at Fig. 23, col. 29, lines 22-28; col. 3, lines 46-60; col. 28, lines 26-37.

8. As per dependent claims 4, 11, "the visualization interface can access the data results as the processing tools are working on the data" at Fig. 6, col. 18, line 59 to col. 19, line 1.

9. As per dependent claims 5, 12, Peters teaches "the visualization interface enables selection of a portion of the data results such that data corresponding to the portion selected may be accessed and processed in real-time to create second data results that are displayed on the visualization interface" at col. 6, line 59 to col. 7, line 6.

10. As per dependent claims 6, 13, Peters teaches "the processing tools enables creation of new processing expressions that are compiled and dynamically linked to the processing tools" at Fig. 6, col. 18, lines 59 to col. 19, line 5.

11. Claims 7, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters (US Patent 5,715,334) hereinafter Peters, in view of Burfeind et al. (US Patent 6,052,648) hereinafter Burfeind and admitted prior art (Hereinafter, APA).

12. As per claims 7, 14, Peters does not explicitly teach accessing the data using direct IO. However, APA teaches accessing data using direct IO (see the instant application on Page 7, Lines 140-141). It would have been obvious to one of those skilled in the art that there would be a faster way to access data directly from devices instead of normal way of accessing data.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

14. If a reference indicated, as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (703) 305-9601 for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (703) 305-3390. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

srp
Sathyanarayan Pannala
Examiner
Art Unit 2177

srp
August 8, 2003


GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER